

OLC RECORD COPY

OLC 78- 2640

18 July 1978

*entire pkg  
filed HSC*

MEMORANDUM FOR: Frederick P. Hitz  
Legislative Counsel

FROM : [REDACTED]  
Assistant Legislative Counsel

SUBJECT : 18 July 1978 Meeting with DDO, OGC,  
and OSO Representatives in Preparation  
for Briefing the House Permanent Select  
Committee on Intelligence on CIA's  
Liaison Relationships

1. [REDACTED] Pursuant to your memorandum dated July 17, 1978  
(attached) I met with Don Gregg who represented DDO, and  
[REDACTED] OGC, and [REDACTED] Office of SIGINT  
Operations (OSO). We reviewed the entire issue of reporting  
on liaison arrangements to Congressional oversight and  
arrived at the following perceptions of the next necessary  
step:

a. We all agreed that the sensitivities  
of many of the countries with whom CIA conducts  
liaison (both SIGINT or HUMINT) are such that  
every effort should be made to avoid identification  
of individual countries and services, except as  
noted below.

b. There is no objection to describing  
generically and in some detail the vast variety  
of liaison relationships that exist. Additionally,  
there is no problem in spelling out the value of  
liaison relationships both in terms of the quality  
of intelligence produced by these relationships  
and coming up with estimates on the amount of  
money saved as a direct result of services/  
information provided via liaison.

25X1 c. There is no objection to providing the  
Committee with detail on some of the liaison  
relationships [REDACTED] which  
are line items in CIA's budget (and have been  
reviewed in budget mark-up). Similarly, there

25X1

is no problem with providing the Committee with an accurate description of the totality of our relationship with one or more of our liaison partners -- so long as we do not identify the country or service involved.

25X1 2. ☐ As you can see the issue is that both DDO and OSO wish to limit the briefings to the extent possible. Don Gregg pointed out that President Carter himself has said that he does not wish to know or need to know the identity of sources. It would seem to follow that oversight committees have no greater need in this regard than the President himself. Admittedly, this is a poor argument to use with the Committee but it does establish a point of reference for planning purposes.

25X1 3. ☐ The next step is to negotiate with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, specifically Tom Latimer, the parameters of any hearing we may have on CIA's liaison relationships. I propose to see Tom Latimer on this issue and attempt to resolve it. It might make sense to take Don Gregg along with me, but I do not feel strongly about it. If I cannot carve out acceptable procedures for the hearing, then you would have to step in. Hopefully, this will not be necessary.

25X1 4. ☐ I am of course free to talk to you about this and believe that Don Gregg will have briefed John Stein, ADDO, along similar lines. I should add that ☐ ☐ (OGC) was in full agreement with the observations of DDO and OSO.

25X1 ☐

Attachment

Distribution  
Orig - adse  
1 - OLC Subject  
1 - OLC Chrono  
OLC:MMP:sf (18 July 1978)

SECRET

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP81M00980R003100020026-8

17 JUL 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: ADDO

OGC

DDS&T (OSO)

PCS/LOC

FROM : Frederick P. Hitz  
Legislative Counsel

SUBJECT : Reporting on CIA Liaison Relationships to  
the House Permanent Select Committee on  
Intelligence

25X1 1. ☐ As addressees may recall, in November 1977 the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) requested that CIA provide a briefing on its foreign intelligence liaison relationships. While the DCI was prepared to brief the Committee during a December 1977 appearance, the time the DCI spent before the Committee on that occasion was devoted to other matters and the subject was never re-addressed in a briefing context. Committee staff have now renewed and refined the original request.

25X1 2. ☐ On 6 July 1978 Thomas K. Latimer, Staff Director, House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, asked that the Committee be briefed on "written agreements that are essentially government to government agreements which have not been reported to Congress under the Case-Zablocki Act." Mr. Latimer indicated that he and the Committee understand that the Agency regards these relationships as both sources and methods of intelligence acquisition, but said that the Committee has a responsibility to be apprised of formal relationships which carry with them substantive commitments on the part of the U.S. Government. He also stated that he was not interested in oral and essentially informal arrangements carved out by present or former Chiefs of Stations with chiefs of foreign intelligence services. No date has yet been set for this requested briefing.

25X1 3. ☐ Reporting to HPSCI on written agreements which are essentially government to government in nature is probably the absolute minimum to which we will be able to limit a briefing on Agency relationships with liaisons. There follows a proposed outline for addressess' consideration

25X1

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP81M00980R003100020026-8

SECRET

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP81M00980R003100020026-8  
in a provision for maintaining the sense of confidentiality implicit in our relationships with the various foreign liaison services.

25X1 4. ☐ I believe the briefing should be oral and off-the-record (i.e., that no transcript be taken) and that it should be stressed throughout the briefing that these arrangements constitute some of our most sensitive activities. In addition, it should be pointed out that our reluctance to brief on such matters stems from the fact that we could very possibly lose the cooperation of foreign intelligence services if they found out that we were briefing Congress on those relationships, given the recent Congressional leak record. I propose the following structure for the briefing:

a. Types of relationships:

SIGINT -- Limit geographical descriptions to general areas, i.e.,

25X1 Tell the Committee what the nature of these relationships are and how we carry them out. The Committee should be briefed in terms of funds expended, passed, material provided, information passed as well as the benefits to the USG from these relationships.

OPERATIONAL -- Again, limit geographical descriptions to general areas and provide the Committee with descriptions of the kinds of relationships encompassed, such as Exchange of Information (what kinds), Ground Rules (such as), Operations (what kinds and with what objectives), as well as the overall benefits to the United States Government.

b. This might also be an opportune moment to discuss with the Committee the overall benefits of liaison relationships; viz., the value of those relationships to the U.S. intelligence effort, the basic philosophical position that there must be net advantage to the USG in order to justify the relationship, the kinds of product that emanate from these relationships and concluding with some kind of estimate on the number of man-years that these relationships save the USG.

c. Once having concluded the opening remarks and briefing, the Committee will most probably ask some specific questions which the briefers will have to respond to in as general terms as the situation permits. Implicit in the proposed briefing outline is that anything we tell the Committee will be more than we wish to give up and less than the Committee will wish to receive. In the latter context it is worth remembering that the more financially significant of these intelligence agreements have already been exposed to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the course of budget mark-up.

25X1 5. ☐ Once a briefing package has been worked out, it will have to be coordinated in scope with DOD and NSA, both of whom are being tasked with similar requirements. Attached are proposed guidelines for NFIB agency responses to Congressional inquiries regarding liaison relationships. The proposed briefing is in general consonance with the guidelines.

25X1 6. ☐ I propose that DDO, OSO and OGC representatives be prepared to meet with ☐ of my staff, at 1030 hours on 18 July 1978 in 5E11. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the above outline and create a briefing package which will be used in briefing the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

SIGNED

Frederick P. Hitz

Attachments  
As stated

Distribution  
Orig - adsees  
1 - OLC Subject  
1 - OLC Chrono  
OLC:MMP:sf (11 July 1978)

SECRET